

REMARKS

Claims 7-26, 29, and 30 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 16, 17- 21, 29, and 30 have been amended. The amendments are not narrowing because they provide antecedent basis and correct formal issues or conform to the usage of terms in the specification. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment to the claims. For the reasons below, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objected to the specification on page 17, lines 2-7 because of an informality. Applicant has corrected this informality by amending the specification.

Rejections under 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-26, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is mooted by the amendment. Independent claims 7, 21 and 29 have been amended to specify that mutually dependent relationships are extracted according to whether they are listed in the mutually dependent relationships extraction rule which comprises a set of categories to be extracted. Support for this amendment is found at page 18, lines 4-15.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-26, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,179, issued to Vaithyanathan (hereafter "Vaithyanathan") in view of over U.S. Patent No. 6,006,221, issued to Liddy (hereafter "Liddy").


As noted above, independent claims 7, 21 and 29 have been amended to specify that mutually dependent relationships are extracted according to whether they are listed in the mutually dependent relationships extraction rule which comprises a set of categories to be extracted. This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Vaithyanathan and Liddy. Claims 8-20 depend on claim 7 and claims 22-26 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected “based on the same reason” as claim 7 on grounds that claims 29 and 30 “covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 20. However, that is not correct. Claims 29 and 30 extract *unique* concepts based on their statistical characteristic. The cited references do not teach or suggest extracting unique concepts based on a statistical characteristic at all. The Office Action contends that “predetermined number” corresponds to the statistical characteristic but Applicant respectfully traverses this conclusion. A predetermined number may not be of a statistical nature.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Serial Number 09/612,136
Attorney Docket Number JA999-118X
Amendment

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: February 12, 2007

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Michael Buchenhorner, PA
8450 SW 83rd Street
Miami, FL 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)